

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on February 22, 2011, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 8-21 and 23-26 are pending in the Application, where claims 1, 11 and 16 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 8-10, 12, 14-19, 21 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0079512 (Yamazaki) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0020939 (Ikeda), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0079653 (Hamon) and U.S. Patent No. 7,289,102 (Hinckley). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon, Hinckley and U.S. Patent No. 5,610,629 (Baur). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon, Hinckley and U.S. Patent No. 6,429,857 (Masters). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon, Hinckley and U.S. Patent No. 5,742,279 (Yamamoto). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon, Hinckley and WO 00/75766 (Macinnes). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon, Hinckley, Masters and Baur. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117735 (Breen) and Hinckley. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 1-5, 8-21 and 23-26 are patentable over Yamazaki, Ikeda, Hamon, Hinckley, Baur, Masters, Yamamoto, Breen, and Macinnes for at least the following reasons.

Yamazaki is directed to an information device with a pen input function. Ikeda is directed to an electronic instrument which can reduce its power consumption. Hamon is directed to a display having a detector to detect the presence of a device that obscures at least part of the viewable area of the display, and a display control element to modify the viewable area when the presence of such a device is detected, as recited in the Abstract. As clearly shown in FIGs 4-5, when a keyboard 17 is placed on the screen 12, the displayed content is re-sized to fit the smaller presentation area of the screen 12, namely, to by reducing the size of the displayed content.

As correctly noted on page 4, first full paragraph of the Office Action, Yamazaki, Ikeda and Hamon do not disclose or suggest moving part of the visual information from obscured parts of the display to the unobscured parts without changing a size of the visual information displayed on the display. Hinckley is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Yamazaki, Ikeda and Hamon.

Hinckley is directed to a display with multiple sensors for generating context values that indicate how the device is situated. FIGs 10 and 11 referred to on page 4, first full paragraph of the Office Action, show portrait and landscape orientations of a mobile device,

where the text having the same size is displayed in the SAME display area, where no portion of the display area is obscured.

It is respectfully submitted that Yamazaki, Ikeda, Hamon, Hinckley, and combinations thereof, do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11 and claim 16, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the apparatus is configured to sense one or more objects when placed upon or positioned in proximity to the display and obscuring at least part of the visual information displayed on the display, and in response to sensing the one or more objects obscuring at least part of the visual information displayed on the display, to adapt the visual information for display on unobscured parts of the display which are unobscured by the one or more objects by moving the at least part of the visual information from obscured parts of the display to the unobscured parts of the display for displaying substantially all the visual information on the unobscured parts without changing a size of the visual information displayed on the display.

Moving information from obscured parts of the display to the unobscured parts of the display without changing a size of the visual information displayed on the display, in response to sensing an object obscuring part of the visual information displayed on the display, is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Yamazaki, Ikeda, Hamon, Hinckley, and combination thereof. While Hinckley discloses re-orienting displayed text between portrait and landscape orientations without changing size of the text, any such re-orienting the displayed text is not in response to sensing display obstruction, and instead is in response to detecting a change in orientation of the mobile device display.

At best, the combination of Yamazaki, Ikeda, Hamon and Hinckley, discloses or suggests reducing the size of the displayed content in response to detecting an obstruction or a keyboard placed on a screen, and displaying the same size text in response to detecting a change in the orientation of the display. Baur, Masters, Yamamoto, Breen, and Macinnes are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Yamazaki, Ikeda, Hamon and Hinckley.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11 and 16 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5, 8-10, 12-15, 17-21 and 23-26 are also allowable at least based on their dependence from amended independent claims 1, and 16 as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

For example, claim 21 specifically recites "to determine an identity of a user from detection of the one or more objects, and to present preferred visual information preferred by the user," and claim 23 specifically recites "to present the preferred visual information preferred by the user for a duration the one or more objects is in proximity of the display." (Illustrative emphasis provided) Portions of Yamazaki cited on page 7, second full paragraph of the Office Action, namely, FIG 21A and paragraphs [0397]-[0400], do not even disclose or suggest presenting any information for the duration when an object is in proximity of the display, let alone disclosing or suggesting presenting any preferred

information, preferred by the user, for the duration when the object is in proximity of the display, as recited in claims 21 and 23, and similarly recited in claims 24-25. Rather, the noted portions of Yamazaki merely disclose identifying a user by reading the user's palm print when placed near the display. Accordingly, allowance of claims 21, 23 and 24-25 is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



By \_\_\_\_\_  
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
May 3, 2011

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**

111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101